9:Maquet E-5 (1949-1951)1961 FO42 Rundi FO42

The district was divided into hills (imusozi). At that level the
627 cattle- and land-chiefs had only one subordinate, the hill-chief, *umutware w'umusozi*, whose counterpart in the present administrative organization is called sub-chief or *ibisonga*.

621 On each hill, there were usually several neighbourhoods. In
622 each, one of the family heads living there was chosen as its head by the hill-chief. He was called *umukoresha*.

(*b*) *Taxes*

651 Tributes and dues for which the land-chief was responsible
647 were: any kind of labour, usually agricultural; *uguhunika* (putting into the granary), which consisted of a certain number of baskets of beans, peas, and sorghum to be delivered at harvest time; *amavu* (bananas to be used for brewing beer). These tributes were due from Hutu. The person who provided these things was the family head who was considered as the individual producer of the rugo. But between him and the land-chief, there was a hierarchy of persons responsible for the carrying out of the levies: sometimes the lineage head (if he was living in the same neighbourhood), then the neighbourhood head, and finally the hill-chief.

[622] Through the hill-chief, too (according to 68 per cent. of the informants), the cattle-chief obtained jars of milk from the Tutsi. Moreover, the latter had to provide (according to 88 per cent.) *inkuke*, cows kept by the beneficiary in order that milk could be consumed fresh.

These tributes were centralized in the royal residence of the district which was occupied by the king when he was travelling in the district. This residence was called *rugo*, the ordinary word meaning a compound dwelling. 95 per cent. of our informants remembered several names of royal district residences and 86 per cent. had not forgotten the name of the residence in the district where they used to live as children.

Revenues of a district were either reserved to the king himself or were granted to one of the king's wives. In the first case, the [647] residence was called *ingaligali* and was administered by a king's concubine (*umuja*, girl-servant).

Administrative officers collecting tributes, had the right to keep a part for their own benefit. According to 95 per cent. of our informants, the hill-chiefs had the right to deduct some agricultural produce, of which they could keep about a third. Then the land-chief—according to 99 per cent.—could also keep a part of it,

9: Maquet E-5 (1949-1951) 1961 FO42 Rundi FO42

probably a little less than a third. For tribute labour, the hill-chief handed over to the residence the number of labourers requested but could have the others to work for himself.

According to respectively 92 and 91 per cent. of the Tutsi interviewed, neither the hill-chief nor the cattle-chief could deduct similar proportions from cattle dues. I have been told, however, that the cattle-chief required from the hill-chief more jars than the royal residence asked. It is very likely that the hill-chief imposed a similar obligation on those who had to bring the milk.

The land-chief acted as judge in disputes about rights over land between Hutu of his district.

Some places were not integrated into the district organization and were free from the cattle- and land-chief interferences. They were the domains belonging to *biru* and the royal funeral grounds. Biru, as we shall see later, were very important people keeping the secret traditions according to which the order of succession of the kings was determined, the ritual to be used in wars, the measures to be taken in times of famine, &c. In their privileged domains biru enjoyed powers similar to those of the king over Ruanda. 76 per cent. of our informants mention the name of a hill ruled by one mwiru (singular of biru) and 79 per cent. affirm that these domains were completely independent of the administrative chiefs.

The other privileged hills were those on which the royal corpses were laid. As the dead body of the king was believed to undergo different metamorphoses, it was not immediately buried, but mummified and left for a certain time in a wood, on the top of a hill. The corpse was watched by some chiefs and servants and finally buried. Even now 88 per cent. of our informants can mention the name of such a hill where a royal cemetery is to be found. One of the more renowned places is Rutare, not far from Kigali, which is mentioned by 71 per cent. 84 per cent. said that these hills were exempted from any tribute to the district residence.

3. ANALYSIS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

Analysis of the different structures described here will be made from the point of view of the social function of these institutions. Social function is understood here as the contribution made by an institution, an association or a cultural trait to the working and the maintenance of a particular social structure. The contribution may

9:Maquet E-5 (1949-1951)1961 FO42 Rundi FO42

be negative or positive. It is to be distinguished from the aim explicitly stated in the charter (written or not) of the institution or the purpose of the association consciously conceived by its members.

Take, for instance, some of the religious ceremonies of a particular group. Their aim as known and admitted by every member of the group may be to honour the ancestral spirits, whereas their function, of which perhaps nobody in the group is completely aware, is to manifest and reinforce the *esprit de corps* of the group. Or an association whose explicit purpose is some philanthropic activity may have as its function the giving of certain political control to a particular set of people. Aim and function are not necessarily different. It may happen that the aim expresses one of the ways in which the institution is significant from the viewpoint of the perpetuation of the particular organization existing in that society.[12]

(*a*) *Fiscal function*

It is not difficult to determine the main social function of the administrative structure of Ruanda. It was identical indeed with its explicitly recognized aim in that society. Aim and function were fiscal: the country had to provide its rulers with consumption goods.

Tribute collecting was very methodically organized. Because of the division of the country into about seventy to ninety districts, the amount to be supplied was distributed in a way which did not favour one region more than another. Even parts of Ruanda which were far from the royal court had to provide dues for the local royal residence. The timing of the levies was also fortunate as the agricultural products were not demanded when the rulers needed them but at harvesting time. Tribute labour seems also to have been regularly required during the year.

Were these impositions heavy? It is very difficult to assess the proportion of foodstuff and labour required from each family head. I gathered from different informants that about a third of the labour of one individual was required from each family. It is important to stress the fact that only one person in each rugo had to fulfil this demand whereas there were usually several men able to give that tribute in each family.

[12] See Radcliffe-Brown, 1922, p. lx; 1940, p. 10; 1952, pp. 200 f; Maquet 1949a; 1954c, p. 63.

9:Maquet E-5 (1949-1951)1961 FO42 Rundi FO42

554 622 184 Ndarwubatse, Kanyonyomba, and Segore were exceptional and that, in fact, Hutu were not very numerous among land-chiefs. The share of Hutu in political power was probably symbolic rather than quantitatively great. Hutu could also be hill-chiefs and sixty-nine per cent. of our informants were able to mention a few names. According to ninety-nine per cent. a Twa could be neither land-chief nor cattle-chief, unless he were ennobled. But in that case, he was not socially a Twa any more, but assimilated to a Tutsi. Twa could be hill-chiefs; sixty-five per cent. of our Tutsi informants mentioned the names of such Twa. Neighbourhood heads were frequently Hutu, but the advantages they drew from their office were minimal, if any.

(*b*) *Maintenance of the central rulers in power*

661 One may conclude that the very great majority of the beneficiaries of the fiscal function of the administrative structure were people of the Tutsi group.

661 634 641 622 A second function of the administrative structure was to enable those who enjoyed political power to keep it. The mwami and his wives centralized the means necessary to afford an important court. Moreover, by granting the profitable offices of land-, cattle-, and hill-chiefs, the mwami increased the number of his faithful dependents. For these chiefs of the administrative structure were appointed by the king. To the question 'who appointed the land- and the cattle-chiefs?' ten different answers were given, but if one adds up all the answers which named the mwami as the person or one of the persons who granted these official appointments, a majority of sixty-five is reached. The confusion in the answers seems due to the fact that different principles operated together in the nomination of such a chief. Firstly, one of the sons of the former office holder usually succeeded to his father, and the latter could often indicate his preferences, but this did not mean that the office was hereditary. Merely, it happened fairly frequently that the mwami liked to strengthen a man's loyalty on the understanding that if he was a good chief, the office could remain in his family. Secondly, the appointment could be made by the mwami following presentation of the candidate by an important chief, such as the army-chief. Consequently, it could appear that the latter was the one who gave the appointment. But the third principle remained: the king kept a complete control of these offices in the sense

9:Maquet E-5 (1949-1951) 1961 FO42 Rundi FO42

that no other authority had the final say in such appointments.

The danger of having some chiefs becoming more and more independent of the central government was avoided by the mwami's power to dismiss anybody and also by the curious duality of chiefs in each district. Increasing the control of the central government over its subordinates seems to have been the function of that duality. Tensions arose between these two chiefs who were neighbours and who exerted their prerogatives in the same territory yet were independent of each other. The mwami was always kept well informed by each of these chiefs of the exactions or suspicious activities of the other. Moreover, both chiefs had the same subordinate, the hill-chief. Consequently the mwami could be sure that if by chance the two chiefs were in agreement, it was very likely that if their common subordinate had some difficulty with one of his superiors, he would attempt and often succeed in getting the other on to his side: *duobus litigantibus tertius gaudens*. In addition, as conflicts of power were unavoidable in such a situation, the chief had to resort to the mwami as judge. In that way the links of the dependence of both of them on the mwami were tightened.

In this analysis it is not suggested that the duality of chiefs was conceived and put into being by a certain mwami in order to fulfil what we regard here as its function. It is possible that it happened in that way. But even if nobody ever thought of reinforcing the royal power by this dual organization, it was nevertheless its function in Ruanda society.

(c) *Social cohesion*

I have mentioned that the hill-chief required dues and tributes not from the individual taxpayer but from the lineage head when possible, and the latter demanded it from the family head. This way of reaching the individual through his kin group and family group enhanced the importance of the descent principle of of kin solidarity. Even in Ruanda where the political organization had taken over so many functions from descent groups, the individual as such was not yet recognized in very important matters like the contributions to the maintenance of the rulers. In this interpretation, the kinship and the administrative structures promote the social cohesion of the group as a whole.

To provide the central government with regular revenues, to

9:Maquet E-5 (1949-1951)1961 FO42 Rundi FO42

To provide the central government with regular revenues, to maintain its predominant and privileged situation, and to favour social cohesion, were the functions of the administrative structure. Moreover, as any authority in Ruanda, the land-chief was judge in the disputes concerning rights over land. The cattle-chief, however, had no judicial capacity because disputes about cattle were dealt with by the army-chief.

Impositions and taxes exist in all societies which have a centralized organization of political power. Rulers to maintain their dominant position need to be able to dispose of great revenues. The more centralized a government is, the larger is the amount of goods needed because the administrative officers are numerous.[13]

This political necessity of taxation has been justified differently according to the ideology of each culture.[14] Thus in modern democratic states, taxes are said to be the contribution of each citizen to the maintenance of services used by all members of the community, such as roads open to everybody, a police force which protects property and life against internal dangers, courts and tribunals for those who feel that they have been wronged and want to obtain reparation, an army which protects the community against an external threat, &c.

In Ruanda, tributes in labour and goods to the mwami were justified by the nature of the royal power. Kingship was divine. The first king of Ruanda, Nkuba (which means lightning), lived in heaven with his wife Nyagasani, their two sons Kigwa and Mututsi, and their daughter, Nyampundu. One day the three siblings fell from heaven and settled on a Ruanda hill. There Kigwa married his sister. Their descendents constituted the Abanyiginya clan. Mututsi, Kigwa's brother, married one of his nieces. Their descendents were the Abega. The two royal clans (usually the Abanyiginya married Abega girls) had thus a divine origin.[15] From this godlike nature of the mwami followed the justification of his absolute power and of the sovereignty of his rights over the people, the cattle, and the land of Ruanda. By virtue of that divine sovereignty, the king could require tribute. Because everything and everybody was his, he could confiscate any cattle or agricultural produce, and take the labour or even the life of anybody.

This was the theory. In fact the mwami did not use his prerogatives more than the rulers who were not divine but had the same means

[13] Maquet, 1952. [14] Maquet, 1954c, p. 65. [15] See Pagès, 1933, p. 491.